



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/531,266	03/20/2000	L. K. Dunican	PM 258100	5657
909	7590	10/06/2003	EXAMINER	
PILLSBURY WINTHROP, LLP			STEADMAN, DAVID J	
P.O. BOX 10500			ART UNIT	
MCLEAN, VA 22102			PAPER NUMBER	
			1652	
			DATE MAILED: 10/06/2003	

20

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/531,266

Applicant(s)

DUNICAN ET AL.

Examiner

David J Steadman

Art Unit

1652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 17-20,22-30,32 and 33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 17-19,22,23 and 33 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24-30 and 32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Status of the Application***

- [1] Claims 17-20, 22-30, and 32-33 are pending in the application.
- [2] Applicant's amendment to the claims in Paper No. 19 filed June 11, 2003, is acknowledged.
- [3] Applicant's arguments filed in Paper No. 19 have been fully considered and are deemed to be persuasive to overcome some of the rejections previously applied. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn.
- [4] The text of those sections of Title 35 U.S. Code not included in the instant action can be found in a prior Office action.

### ***Claim Objections***

- [5] Claim 20 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, First Paragraph***

- [6] Claims 24-30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a polynucleotide encoding SEQ ID NO:2, does not reasonably provide enablement for the broad scope of polynucleotides

Art Unit: 1652

encoding amino acid sequences that are at least 80%, 90%, or 95% identical to SEQ ID NO:2. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

It is the examiner's position that undue experimentation would be required for a skilled artisan to make the entire scope of the claimed invention. Factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required are summarized in *In re Wands* (858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988)) as follows: (A) The breadth of the claims; (B) The nature of the invention; (C) The state of the prior art; (D) The level of one of ordinary skill; (E) The level of predictability in the art; (F) The amount of direction provided by the inventor; (G) The existence of working examples; and (H) The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure. See MPEP § 2164.01(a). The Factors most relevant to the instant rejection are addressed in detail below.

- The claims are overly broad in scope: Claims 24-26 (claims 27-30 and 32 dependent therefrom) are so broad as to encompass *all* polynucleotides encoding amino acid sequences that are at least 80%, 90%, or 95% identical to SEQ ID NO:2, including any insertion(s), deletion(s), addition(s), or substitution(s) of encoded amino acids encompassed by the scope of the claims. The broad scope of claimed polynucleotides is not commensurate with the enablement provided by the disclosure with regard to the extremely large number of polynucleotides broadly encompassed by

the claims. In this case the disclosure is limited to a polynucleotide encoding SEQ ID NO:2 including SEQ ID NO:1.

- The lack of guidance and working examples: The specification provides only a *single* working example of the claimed polynucleotide, i.e., SEQ ID NO:1. This single working example fails to provide the necessary guidance for making the entire scope of claimed polynucleotides. Neither the specification nor the prior art provides guidance regarding those nucleotides of SEQ ID NO:1 or amino acids of SEQ ID NO:2 that may be altered by any substitution, addition, insertion, and/or deletion within the scope of the claims with an expectation of maintaining the transaldolase enzymatic activity. While it is acknowledged that the specification provides methods for isolation of nucleic acids encoding a *tal* gene from *C. glutamicum*, this is merely a starting point from which one of skill in the art can perform further experimentation in order to practice the claimed invention and does not constitute an enabling disclosure that would teach a skilled artisan how to make the entire scope of claimed polynucleotides. See *University of Rochester v. G.D. Searle & Co. Inc.*, W.D. N.Y., No. 00-CV-6161L, 3/5/03.
- The high degree of unpredictability in the art: Because the specification fails to provides guidance as to those nucleotides of SEQ ID NO:1 or amino acids of SEQ ID NO:2 that may be altered as described above without altering transaldolase activity, a high degree of unpredictability exists in making the entire scope of claimed polynucleotides. The nucleotide sequence of an encoding nucleic acid determines the corresponding encoded protein's structural and functional properties. Predictability of which changes can be tolerated in an encoded protein's amino acid sequence and

obtain the desired activity requires a knowledge of and guidance with regard to which amino acids in the protein's sequence, if any, are tolerant of modification and which are conserved (i.e., expectedly intolerant to modification), and detailed knowledge of the ways in which the proteins' structure relates to its function. The positions within an encoding nucleic acid's sequence where modifications can be made with a reasonable expectation of success in obtaining an encoded polypeptide having the desired activity/utility are limited in any protein and the result of such modifications is highly unpredictable. In addition, one skilled in the art would expect any tolerance to modification for a given protein to diminish with each further and additional modification, e.g. multiple substitutions. In this case, the necessary guidance has not been provided in the specification as explained in detail above. Thus, a skilled artisan would recognize the high degree of unpredictability in making the entire scope of claimed polynucleotides having the desired transaldolase activity.

- The state of the prior art supports the high degree of unpredictability: The state of the art provides evidence for the high degree of unpredictability in altering a polynucleotide sequence with an expectation that the encoded polypeptide will maintain the desired activity/utility. For example, Branden et al. ("Introduction to Protein Structure", Garland Publishing Inc., New York, 1991) teach "[p]rotein engineers frequently have been surprised by the range of effects caused by single mutations that they hoped would change only one specific and simple property in enzymes" and "[t]he often surprising results of such experiments reveal how little we know about the rules of protein stability... ..they also serve to emphasize how difficult it is to design *de novo*

stable proteins with specific functions" (page 247). While it is acknowledged that this reference was published in 1991, to date there remains no certain method for reasonably predicting the effects of even a *single* amino acid mutation on a protein. Such mutations may even completely alter a protein's activity. As a representative example, Witkowski et al. (*Biochemistry* 38:11643-11650) teaches that a single amino acid substitution results in conversion of the parent polypeptide's activity from a beta-ketoacyl synthase to a malonyl decarboxylase (see e.g., Table 1, page 11647). Thus, the prior art acknowledges the unpredictability of altering a protein-encoding sequence with an expectation of obtaining a protein having a desired function and discloses that even a single substitution in a polypeptide's amino acid sequence may completely alter the function of a polypeptide.

- The amount of experimentation required is undue: While methods of generating variants of a given polynucleotide, e.g., mutagenesis, and methods of isolating homologous polynucleotides, e.g., hybridization, are known, it is not routine in the art to screen for *all* polynucleotides having a substantial number of substitutions or modifications as encompassed by the instant claims. Thus, in view of the overly broad scope of the claims, the lack of guidance and working examples provided in the specification, and the high degree of unpredictability as evidenced by the prior art, undue experimentation would be necessary for a skilled artisan to make and use the entire scope of the claimed invention.

Thus, applicant has not provided sufficient guidance to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention in a manner reasonably correlated

Art Unit: 1652

with the scope of the claims. The scope of the claims must bear a reasonable correlation with the scope of enablement (*In re Fisher*, 166 USPQ 19 24 (CCPA 1970)). Without sufficient guidance, determination of having the desired biological characteristics is unpredictable and the experimentation left to those skilled in the art is unnecessarily, and improperly, extensive and undue. See *In re Wands* 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2nd 1400 (Fed. Cir, 1988).


### **Conclusion**

**[7] Status of the claims:**

- Claims 17-20, 22-30, and 32-33 are pending.
- Claims 17-19, 22-23, and 33 are in condition for allowance.
- Claims 24-30 and 32 are rejected.
- Claim 20 is objected to.
- Claims 35-38, 40, 41, 43, and 47-50 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Steadman, whose telephone number is (703) 308-3934. The Examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 7:00 am to 5:00 pm. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Ponnathapura Achutamurthy, can be reached at (703) 308-3804. The FAX number for submission of official papers to Group 1600 is (703) 308-4242. Draft or informal FAX communications should be directed to (703) 746-5078. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Art Unit receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

David J. Steadman  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1652



PONNATHAPU ACHUTAMURTHY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600